REMARKS/ARGUMENTS

Claims 21-26 and 28-52 are pending in this application. By this Amendment, Applicant AMENDS claims 21, 22, 35, 36, and 38-40, CANCELS claim 27, and ADDS new claims 41-52.

Support for newly added claim 41 can be found, for example, in Figs. 1, 2, and 4 of Applicant's drawings, in Applicant's originally filed claim 1, and in paragraphs [0021], [0028], [0029], [0032], [0033], [0070], [0080], [0082], [0083], [0085], [0089], [0092], [0104]-[0107], and [0109] of Applicant's substitute specification.

Support for newly added claims 42-45 can be found, for example, in Applicant's originally filed claims 8-11.

Support for newly added claims 46 and 47 can be found, for example, in Figs. 4 and 5 of Applicant's drawings and in paragraphs [0116]-[0119] of Applicant's substitute specification.

Support for newly added claim 48 can be found, for example, in Figs. 1, 4, and 6 of Applicant's drawings, and in paragraphs [0092], [0113], and [0121] of Applicant's substitute specification.

Support for newly added claims 49 and 50 can be found, for example, in paragraphs [0068] and [0080] of Applicant's substitute specification.

Support for newly added claims 51 and 52 can be found, for example, in Applicant's originally filed claims 13 and 14.

The Examiner objected to claims 22 and 36 under 37 C.F.R. 1.75 for allegedly being substantial duplicates of claims 21 and 35. Applicant respectfully disagrees with the Examiner's allegation that claims 22 and 36 are substantial duplicates of claims 21 and 35. Instead, Applicant respectfully submits that the display control device of Applicant's claim 21 only causes an image to be displayed on a display screen (which could be performed through an intermediary device) while the display control device of Applicant's claim 22 is directly arranged to display an image on the display screen. Applicant further submits that claim 36 includes the feature of display layouts including images indicating information on the vehicle while claim 35 does not include these images indicating information on the vehicle. Thus, contrary to the Examiner's allegations, the scopes of claims 21 and 22 and claims 35 and 36 are different.

Accordingly, Applicant respectfully requests reconsideration and withdrawal of the objection to claim 22 and 36.

Claims 21-24, 27-29, and 31-40 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 102(b) as being anticipated by Makoto (JP 2003-016595). Claims 25 and 26 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Makoto in view of Nojima (U.S. 5,764,139). Claim 30 was rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Makoto in view of Shimizu (U.S. 7,366,595).

As indicated above, Applicant has canceled claim 27. Applicant respectfully traverses the rejections of claims 21-26 and 28-40.

Claim 21 has been amended to recite:

> An onboard display device for displaying an image outside of a vehicle inputted from an image capture section on a display screen, the onboard display device comprising:
>
> a display control section arranged to receive an image display instruction for checking a rightward or a leftward outside area of the vehicle, and to cause the display screen to display a rightward outside area image or a leftward outside area image of the vehicle, the rightward outside area image or the leftward outside area image being captured by the image capture section; and
>
> an image processing section arranged to cause a manner in which the rightward outside area image is displayed to be different from a manner in which the leftward outside area image is displayed; wherein
>
> **the image processing section is arranged to display the rightward outside area image and the leftward outside area image in different shaped frames on the display screen.** (emphasis added)

Applicant's claims 22, 35, 36, 39, and 40 recite features that are similar to the features recited in Applicant's claim 21, including the above-emphasized features.

With the unique combination and arrangement of features recited in Applicant's claims 21, 22, 35, 36, 39, and 40, including the feature of "the image processing section is arranged to display the rightward outside area image and the leftward outside area image in different shaped frames on the display screen," Applicant has been able to provide an onboard display device, a vehicle, a display method, an image display program, and a tangible recording

medium, which make it easier to drive a vehicle (see, for example, paragraph [0012] of Applicant's substitute specification).

Applicant has amended claim 21 to recite the feature of "the image processing section is arranged to display the rightward outside area image and the leftward outside area image in different shaped frames on the display screen." This feature is similar to the features originally recited in presently canceled claim 27. Claims 22, 35, 36, 39, and 40 have also been amended to recite similar features.

In the outstanding Office Action, the Examiner alleged that Makoto teaches all of the features presently recited in Applicant's claim 27. More specifically, the Examiner alleged that Makoto teaches, along with the rest of the features presently recited in Applicant's claim 27, that "the image processing device is arranged to display the rightward outside area image and the leftward outside area image in different frame shapes on the display screen (reversed method photography picture of left-hand side, paragraph 19)." Applicant respectfully disagrees.

Makoto teaches a vehicle including a plurality of cameras arranged to capture images of the outside surroundings of the vehicle. The vehicle further includes a vehicle drive assist device with a display separated into a left side section and a right side section that displays, along with, for example, a GPS navigation image, (i) a leftward image captured by a leftward outside camera on a left side of a display section when the vehicle is making make a left turn, and (ii) a rightward outside image captured by a rightward outside camera on a right side of the display section when the vehicle is to make a right turn, as shown in Figs. 3 and 4 of Makoto.

Paragraph [0016] of Makoto further teaches that left rear and right rear images of Makoto are both displayed at a reverse angle to match what the driver of the vehicle would expect to see in a side mirror of the vehicle to avoid confusing the driver of the vehicle. In the outstanding Office Action, the Examiner alleged that this teaching of displaying left rear and right rear images at a reverse angle corresponded to the displaying the rightward outside area image in a different manner from a manner in which the leftward outside area image is displayed and further alleged that these different manners were provided in different shapes on the display of Makoto. However, as discussed above and as can be seen in Figs. 3 and 4 of

Makoto, this portion of Makoto only teaches that the images are merely displayed at a revere angle and does not teach or suggest anything at all about providing the reverse angled left rear and right rear images of Makoto in different shaped frames.

Thus, Makoto clearly fails to teach or suggest the feature of "the image processing section is arranged to display the rightward outside area image and the leftward outside area image in different shaped frames on the display screen" as recited in Applicant's claims 21, 22, 35, 36, 39, and 40.

Accordingly, Applicant respectfully requests reconsideration and withdrawal of the rejection of claims 21, 22, 35, 36, 39, and 40 under 35 U.S.C. § 102(b) as being anticipated by Makoto.

The Examiner relied upon Nojima and Shimizu to allegedly cure the deficiencies of Makoto. However, Nojima and Shimizu clearly fail to teach or suggest the feature of "the image processing section is arranged to display the rightward outside area image and the leftward outside area image in different shaped frames on the display screen" as recited in Applicant's claims 21, 22, 35, 36, 39, and 40. Thus, Applicant respectfully submits that Nojima and Shimizu fail to cure the deficiencies of Makoto described above.

Accordingly, Applicant respectfully submits that Makoto, Nojima, and Shimizu, applied alone or in combination, fail to teach or suggest the unique combination and arrangement of elements recited in Applicant's claims 21, 22, 35, 36, 39, and 40.

Applicant's new claim 41 recites:

> An onboard display device for displaying information concerning a vehicle condition and image data inputted by an image capture section which captures an image around a vehicle, comprising:
>
> a display control section arranged to cause a display screen of the onboard display device which display screen is longer in width than in height (i) **to concurrently display an additional image such as a navigation image and the information concerning the vehicle condition in a normal running mode** and (ii) to display a rightward rear view image or a leftward rear view image captured by the image capture section only when an image display instruction for checking a rightward rear view or an image display instruction for checking a leftward rear view is supplied from the vehicle; and

> **an image processing section arranged (i) to cause a speedometer out of the information concerning the vehicle condition to be fixedly displayed in front of a driver, (ii) to cause the leftward rear view image out of the image data inputted by the image capture section to be displayed on a left side of the speedometer when the image display instruction for checking the leftward rear view is received, and (iii) to cause the rightward rear view image out of the image data inputted by the image capture section to be displayed on a right side of the speedometer when the image display instruction for checking the rightward rear view is received, the leftward rear view image and the rightward rear view image not being concurrently displayed.** (emphasis added)

With the unique combination and arrangement of features recited in Applicant's claim 41, including the features of "to concurrently display an additional image such as a navigation Image and the information concerning the vehicle condition in a normal running mode" and "an image processing section arranged (i) to cause a speedometer out of the information concerning the vehicle condition to be fixedly displayed in front of a driver, (ii) to cause the leftward rear view image out of the image data inputted by the image capture section to be displayed on a left side of the speedometer when the image display instruction for checking the leftward rear view is received, and (iii) to cause the rightward rear view image out of the image data inputted by the image capture section to be displayed on a right side of the speedometer when the image display instruction for checking the rightward rear view is received, the leftward rear view image and the rightward rear view image not being concurrently displayed," Applicant has been able to provide an onboard display device, a vehicle, a display method, an image display program, and a tangible recording medium, which make it easier to drive a vehicle (see, for example, paragraph [0012] of Applicant's substitute specification).

Applicant's claim 41 recites the feature of "to concurrently display an additional image such as a navigation Image and the information concerning the vehicle condition in a normal running mode" and "an image processing section arranged (i) to cause a speedometer out of the information concerning the vehicle condition to be fixedly displayed in front of a driver, (ii) to cause the leftward rear view image out of the image data inputted by the image capture section to be displayed on a left side of the speedometer when the image display instruction for checking the leftward rear view is received, and (iii) to cause the rightward rear view image out

of the image data inputted by the image capture section to be displayed on a right side of the speedometer when the image display instruction for checking the rightward rear view is received, the leftward rear view image and the rightward rear view image not being concurrently displayed."

None of Makoto, Nojima, or Shimizu teach or suggest these features.

Makoto teaches a vehicle including a plurality of cameras arranged to capture images of the outside surroundings of the vehicle. The vehicle further includes a vehicle drive assist device with a display separated into a left side section and a right side section that displays, along with, for example, a GPS navigation image, (i) a leftward image captured by a leftward outside camera on a left side of a display section when the vehicle is making make a left turn, and (ii) a rightward outside image captured by a rightward outside camera on a right side of the display section when the vehicle is to make a right turn, as shown in Figs. 3 and 4 of Makoto.

However, Makoto does not teach or suggest the features of "to concurrently display an additional image such as a navigation Image and the information concerning the vehicle condition in a normal running mode" and "an image processing section arranged (i) to cause a speedometer out of the information concerning the vehicle condition to be fixedly displayed in front of a driver, (ii) to cause the leftward rear view image out of the image data inputted by the image capture section to be displayed on a left side of the speedometer when the image display instruction for checking the leftward rear view is received, and (iii) to cause the rightward rear view image out of the image data inputted by the image capture section to be displayed on a right side of the speedometer when the image display instruction for checking the rightward rear view is received, the leftward rear view image and the rightward rear view image not being concurrently displayed" as recited in Applicant's claim 41.

Nojima and Shimizu also clearly fail to teach or suggest the features of "to concurrently display an additional image such as a navigation Image and the information concerning the vehicle condition in a normal running mode" and "an image processing section arranged (i) to cause a speedometer out of the information concerning the vehicle condition to be fixedly displayed in front of a driver, (ii) to cause the leftward rear view image out of the image data

inputted by the image capture section to be displayed on a left side of the speedometer when the image display instruction for checking the leftward rear view is received, and (iii) to cause the rightward rear view image out of the image data inputted by the image capture section to be displayed on a right side of the speedometer when the image display instruction for checking the rightward rear view is received, the leftward rear view image and the rightward rear view image not being concurrently displayed" as recited in Applicant's claim 41. Thus, Applicant respectfully submits that Nojima and Shimizu fail to cure the deficiencies of Makoto described above.

Accordingly, Applicant respectfully submits that Makoto, Nojima, and Shimizu, applied alone or in combination, fail to teach or suggest the unique combination and arrangement of elements recited in Applicant's claim 41.

In view of the foregoing amendments and remarks, Applicant respectfully submits that claims 21, 22, 35, 36, and 39-41 are allowable. Claims 23-26, 28-34, 37, 38, and 42-52 depend upon claims 21, 22, 35, 36, and 39-41, and are therefore allowable for at least the reasons that claims 21, 22, 35, 36, and 39-41 are allowable.

In view of the foregoing amendments and remarks, Applicant respectfully submits that this application is in condition for allowance. Favorable consideration and prompt allowance are solicited.

The Commissioner is authorized to charge any shortage in fees due in connection with the filing of this paper, including extension of time fees, to Deposit Account No. 50-1353.

Respectfully submitted,

Dated: October 21, 2010

/Erik Preston #64,733/
Attorneys for Applicant

KEATING & BENNETT, LLP
1800 Alexander Bell Drive, Suite 200
Reston, VA 20191
Telephone: (571) 313-7440
Facsimile: (571) 313-7421

Joseph R. Keating
Registration No. 37,368

Erik Preston
Registration No. 64,733